



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,263	09/12/2003	Christopher Berti	600.1289	7788
23280	7590	12/29/2009	EXAMINER	
Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC 485 7th Avenue 14th Floor New York, NY 10018			DICKERSON, CHAD S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2625		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		12/29/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/661,263	BERTI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAD DICKERSON	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's Appeal Brief was received on 9/18/09, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-25** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. In view of the appeal brief filed on 9/18/2009, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

New grounds of rejections are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-7 and 13-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, the claim limitation of "wherein the operations to be carried out" renders the claim indefinite. Is this phrase referring to the adjustment and maintenance operations mentioned in the earlier claim limitation? If so, it is recommended that the intended phrase be included in the indefinite claim phrase in question. It is also suggested that the claimed phrase in claim 2 that states "the order of operations" incorporate the intended claim language of "adjustment and maintenance operations". The claims 2-7 are also rejected because of their dependency.

Claim 13 states the claim limitation of "wherein the operations to be carried out" renders the claim indefinite. The recommended change previously mentioned is suggested for this claim as well. The phrase "to be carried out during the job between the first machine job and the subsequent machine job" in claim 13 renders the claim indefinite. It is suggested that this phrase reflect the language below that the operations are carried out during the job change. Dependent claim 18 states "the operations", but it is recommended that the addition of adjustment and maintenance operations replace the word operations. Claims of 14-25 are also rejected based on their dependency.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/18/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. When viewing the Arguments in reference to the independent claims, the Examiner still believes that the majority of the claims are still disclosed. For example, regarding the independent claims, the Zingher reference discloses re-sorting the print contents of jobs within the system by comparing the image contents of each job to one another in order to limit the amount of working steps to be applied between jobs. Some of the working steps can include changing the print form or changing the ink profile and/or film thickness gradient in the inking unit of the printing device¹. With the printing jobs changing from one job to another, the system determines how to transition to the next job with the slightest amount of adjustment in the printing system. As described in Applicant's specification, the specification discloses establishing an order of adjustments and maintenance operations as changing the printing ink². However, other adjustment and maintenance operations can be performed in order to transition a printing device to print a subsequent job besides the changing of printing ink. Since the reference of Zingher '468 discloses the feature of changing an ink profile and the reference can perform changing this profile using jobs of single color being transitioned to jobs of multiple colors, it is understood that the process of changing the printing ink in terms of color is performed during the job change process³. Therefore, the Examiner still maintains the rejection of the independent claims using the Zingher '468 reference in view of the Löffler '820 reference.

¹ See Zingher '468 at col. 3, ll. 57-67 and col. 4, ll. 1-17.

The Applicant also argued the feature of “establishing an order of adjustment and maintenance operations” are not disclosed. The Zingher reference establishes an order of adjustment and maintenance operations through first sorting out the jobs in a certain order. Once this order is established, the re-adjustments to be performed that are associated with each job step are also determined. Since each job may be associated with a adjustment to the printing system and this readjustment is done in a certain order to ensure that the amount of working steps are at a minimum, the Examiner believes that the Zingher reference performs the claim limitation of the independent claims⁴. All of this is performed by some CPU in the printing device, but this transitioning between jobs being determined by a computer is also performed by the reference of Löffler⁵.

As far as the other arguments regarding the claims, most of the arguments are same in terms of the same references applied except for claims 7 and 10. The Noyes reference is being withdrawn. However, the Examiner’s remarks regarding the references of Rai ‘747, Bauer ‘461 and Yacoub ‘805 applied to claims are unchanged and are omitted from this action since they can be referred to in the previous Office Actions mailed to Applicant’s representative.

6. Applicant’s arguments, see pages 21-23 of Appeal brief, filed 9/18/2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 7 and 10 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Tada ‘652.

² See Applicant’s specification at ¶ [0006] on page 2.

³ See Zingher ‘468 at col. 7, II. 35-63, col. 8, II. 15-67 and col. 9, II. 1-17.

⁴ Id. at col. 3, II. 57-67 and col. 4, II. 1-17.

⁵ See Löffler ‘820 at col. 2, line 15-20.

With the withdrawal of the Noyes reference and the addition of the Tada '652 reference, the combination yields a system that allows for the printing system to communicate necessary operation steps to the operator using the printing device⁶. The printing device indicates to the operator what steps to perform in the output process. This performs the feature of communicating auditory instructions to a user in the operation of a printing device. The Wasenius reference is also being replaced by the reference of Silvester '292, which includes a wireless headset that is able to relay acoustic communication to a user and is connected to a master device, a computer (200), which is also connected to a printer (170)⁷. Therefore, with the system of Tada '652 to perform the feature of acoustic communication combined with the feature of having a wireless device, such as a headset, connected to a computer, the claim limitations of 7, 10 and 11 are believed to be performed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 2, 8, 13, 17-22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher '468 (USP 5930468) in view of Löffler '820 (USP 5010820).

⁶ See Tada '652 at col. 1, ll. 57-64.

⁷ See Silvester '292 at ¶ [0045]-[0047].

Re claim 1: Zingher '468 discloses a method for determining an optimum procedure for a job change on a printing-material processing machine having at least one control computer, the method comprising:

comparing first data of a first machine job to second data of a subsequent machine job using the at least one control computer (i.e. in Zingher '468, the image contents of the print jobs, considered as the data of a machine job, are compared to one another. The above feature is performed since the image contents of individual print jobs are compared to one another in pairs or twos. This means that image contents of a first print job is compared to the image contents of a subsequent print job. The image contents are analogous to the first and second print data. This process is controlled by the data processing device, which is able to compare print jobs in pairs since an order of the processing of a current print job is based on the comparison of the current print job and the previous print job; see fig. 4; col. 3, lines 1-66, col. 4, lines 1-17, 44-63 and col. 5, lines 8-49), and

establishing an order of the adjustment and maintenance operations to be carried out during the job change between the first machine job and the subsequent machine job as a function of the comparing step (i.e. regarding the claim feature, the Zingher reference discloses re-sorting the print contents of jobs within the system by comparing the image contents of each job to one another in order to limit the amount of working steps to be applied between jobs. Some of the working steps can include changing the print form, changing the ink profile or film thickness gradient in the inking unit of the printing device. With the printing jobs changing from one job to another, the system

determines how to transition to the next job with the slightest amount of adjustment in the printing system. As described in Applicant's specification, the specification discloses establishing an order of adjustments and maintenance operations as changing the printing ink. However, other adjustment and maintenance operations can be performed in order to transition a printing device to print a subsequent job besides the changing of printing ink. Since the reference of Zingher '468 discloses the feature of changing an ink profile and the reference can perform changing this profile using jobs of single color being transitioned to jobs of multiple colors, it is understood that the process of changing the printing ink in terms of color is performed. In terms of establishing an order of these operations, with each job, a certain change can occur. To transition from job 1 to job 2, a slight change in ink profile may be needed, then changing to job 3 may require a change in the printing form and a change to job 4 may require a film thickness gradient change in the inking unit. Since these different operations can be different depending on the content of the jobs, these operations change, but they have to be established when going from job to job in the system in order to ensure a minimum amount of work for the printing system while changing from job to job. Therefore, since a certain adjustment process can occur for different jobs in different ways and this is established in order for the jobs to be processed, it is believed that the above feature is performed; See col. 3, ll. 57-67, col. 4, ll. 1-17, col. 8, ll. 15-67 and col. 9, ll. 1-17).

However, Zingher '468 fails to specifically teach wherein the operations to be carried out during the job change are performed on at least two different components of

the printing press to prepare the at least two components for printing the subsequent machine job.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Löffler '820. Löffler '820 discloses wherein the operations to be carried out during the job change are performed on at least two different components of the printing press to prepare the at least two components for printing the subsequent machine job (i.e. like the invention of Zingher, the Löffler reference is used to output printing information using production equipment (same field of endeavor). However, in column 5, lines 14-31, the system discloses changing an ink profile from a recently performed job to a subsequent job. Here, this process discloses adjusting ink metering elements and ink duct rollers for removal of an old profile. With the performance of adjusting these two different elements, the newly added claim feature above is performed; see col. 5, lines 14-31).

Therefore, in view of Löffler '820, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of wherein the operations to be carried out during the job change are performed on at least two different components of the printing press to prepare the at least two components for printing the subsequent machine job, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, in order to have the establishment of an ink profile required for a subsequent print job accomplished by individual process steps (as stated in Löffler '820 col. 4, ln 49-58).

Re claim 2: The teachings of Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820 are disclosed above

Zingher '468 discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the order of operations to be carried out during the job change is calculated in such a manner that a set-up time or a downtime during the job change is minimized (i.e. the sequence in which individual print jobs are carried out one after another during which a job change occurs is performed in a manner in which the setting time needed to change the print job is minimal; see col. 3, lines 1-66, col. 4, lines 1-17).

Re claim 8: A device for determining an optimum procedure for a job change on a printing-material processing machine comprising:

at least one control computer comparing first data of a first machine job to second data of a subsequent machine job (i.e. in Zingher '468, the image contents of the print jobs, considered as the data of a machine job, are compared to one another. The above feature is performed since the image contents of individual print jobs are compared to one another in pairs or twos. This means that image contents of a first print job is compared to the image contents of a subsequent print job. The image contents are analogous to the first and second print data. This process is controlled by the data processing device, which is able to compare print jobs in pairs since an order of the processing of a current print job is based on the comparison of the current print job and the previous print job; see fig. 4; col. 3, lines 1-66, col. 4, lines 1-17, 44-63 and col. 5, lines 8-49), and

executing program steps as a function of the comparing step to establish an order of operations to be carried out during the job change (i.e. regarding the claim

feature, the Zingher reference discloses re-sorting the print contents of jobs within the system by comparing the image contents of each job to one another in order to limit the amount of working steps to be applied between jobs. Some of the working steps can include changing the print form, changing the ink profile or film thickness gradient in the inking unit of the printing device. With the printing jobs changing from one job to another, the system determines how to transition to the next job with the slightest amount of adjustment in the printing system. As described in Applicant's specification, the specification discloses establishing an order of adjustments and maintenance operations as changing the printing ink. However, other adjustment and maintenance operations can be performed in order to transition a printing device to print a subsequent job besides the changing of printing ink. Since the reference of Zingher '468 discloses the feature of changing an ink profile and the reference can perform changing this profile using jobs of single color being transitioned to jobs of multiple colors, it is understood that the process of changing the printing ink in terms of color is performed. In terms of establishing an order of these operations, with each job, a certain change can occur. To transition from job 1 to job 2, a slight change in ink profile may be needed, then changing to job 3 may require a change in the printing form and a change to job 4 may require a film thickness gradient change in the inking unit. Since these different operations can be different depending on the content of the jobs, these operations change, but they have to be established when going from job to job in the system in order to ensure a minimum amount of work for the printing system while changing from job to job. Therefore, since a certain adjustment process can occur for

different jobs in different ways and this is established in order for the jobs to be processed, it is believed that the above feature is performed; See col. 3, ll. 57-67, col. 4, ll. 1-17, col. 8, ll. 15-67 and col. 9, ll. 1-17).

However, Zingher '468 fails to specifically teach wherein the operations to be carried out during the job change are performed on at least two different components of the printing press to prepare the at least two components for printing the subsequent machine job.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Löffler '820. Löffler '820 discloses wherein the operations to be carried out during the job change are performed on at least two different components of the printing press to prepare the at least two components for printing the subsequent machine job (i.e. in the cited portion, in column 5, lines 14-31, the system discloses changing an ink profile from a recently performed job to a subsequent job. Here, this process discloses adjusting ink metering elements and ink duct rollers for removal of an old profile. With the performance of adjusting these two different elements, the newly added claim feature above is performed; see col. 5, lines 14-31).

Therefore, in view of Löffler '820, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of wherein the operations to be carried out during the job change are performed on at least two different components of the printing press to prepare the at least two components for printing the subsequent machine job, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, in order to have the

establishment of an ink profile required for a subsequent print job accomplished by individual process steps (as stated in Löffler '820 col. 4, ln 49-58).

Re claim 13: Zingher '468 discloses a printing press comprising:

a device for determining an optimum procedure for a job change between a first machine job and a subsequent machine job on a printing-material processing machine (the data processing device is used to perform the determination of an optimum procedure for a job change on a printing machine. The optimum procedure for the job change is in terms of time, process and/or economy of materials; see fig. 4; col. 3, lines 1-66, col. 4, lines 1-17, 44-63 and col. 5, lines 8-49),

the device including at least one control computer comparing first data of a first machine job to second data of a subsequent machine job (i.e. in Zingher '468, the image contents of the print jobs, considered as the data of a machine job, are compared to one another. The above feature is performed since the image contents of individual print jobs are compared to one another in pairs or twos. This means that image contents of a first print job is compared to the image contents of a subsequent print job. The image contents are analogous to the first and second print data. This process is controlled by the data processing device, which is able to compare print jobs in pairs since an order of the processing of a current print job is based on the comparison of the current print job and the previous print job; see fig. 4; col. 3, lines 1-66, col. 4, lines 1-17, 44-63 and col. 5, lines 8-49), and

executing program steps as a function of the comparing step to establish an order of operations to be carried out during the job between the first machine job and the subsequent machine job (i.e. regarding the claim feature, the Zingher reference discloses re-sorting the print contents of jobs within the system by comparing the image contents of each job to one another in order to limit the amount of working steps to be applied between jobs. Some of the working steps can include changing the print form, changing the ink profile or film thickness gradient in the inking unit of the printing device. With the printing jobs changing from one job to another, the system determines how to transition to the next job with the slightest amount of adjustment in the printing system. As described in Applicant's specification, the specification discloses establishing an order of adjustments and maintenance operations as changing the printing ink. However, other adjustment and maintenance operations can be performed in order to transition a printing device to print a subsequent job besides the changing of printing ink. Since the reference of Zingher '468 discloses the feature of changing an ink profile and the reference can perform changing this profile using jobs of single color being transitioned to jobs of multiple colors, it is understood that the process of changing the printing ink in terms of color is performed. In terms of establishing an order of these operations, with each job, a certain change can occur. To transition from job 1 to job 2, a slight change in ink profile may be needed, then changing to job 3 may require a change in the printing form and a change to job 4 may require a film thickness gradient change in the inking unit. Since these different operations can be different depending on the content of the jobs, these operations change, but they have to be established

when going from job to job in the system in order to ensure a minimum amount of work for the printing system while changing from job to job. Therefore, since a certain adjustment process can occur for different jobs in different ways and this is established in order for the jobs to be processed, it is believed that the above feature is performed; See col. 3, ll. 57-67, col. 4, ll. 1-17, col. 8, ll. 15-67 and col. 9, ll. 1-17).

However, Zingher '468 fails to specifically teach to establish wherein the operations to be carried out during the job change are performed on at least two different components of the printing press to prepare the at least two components for printing the subsequent machine job.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Löffler '820. Löffler '820 discloses to wherein the operations to be carried out during the job change are performed on at least two different components of the printing press to prepare the at least two components for printing the subsequent machine job (i.e. in the cited portion, in column 5, lines 14-31, the system discloses changing an ink profile from a recently performed job to a subsequent job. Here, this process discloses adjusting ink metering elements and ink duct rollers for removal of an old profile. With the performance of adjusting these two different elements, the newly added claim feature above is performed; see col. 5, lines 14-31).

Therefore, in view of Löffler '820, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of wherein the operations to be carried out during the job change are performed on at least two different components of the printing press to prepare the at least two components for printing the subsequent

machine job, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, in order to have the establishment of an ink profile required for a subsequent print job accomplished by individual process steps (as stated in Löffler '820 col. 4, ln 49-58).

Re claim 17: The teachings of Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820 are disclosed above. Zingher '468 discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the establishing of the order of operations is based solely on the comparing of the first data to the second data (i.e. in the system the print jobs are compared to each other in pairs, or one job to another job. Once this comparison is performed by the system, the print jobs are ordered in an established manner and the operations, or working steps that are used to process those print jobs in the most efficient manner are also ordered. One job change to another may merit a change in printing form or ink profile. This change in either operation in the printing device depends on the comparison between the two jobs; see col. 3, lines 1-67 and col. 4, lines 1-17).

Re claim 18: The teachings of Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820 are disclosed above. Zingher '468 discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the establishing step includes determining if a first of the operation should occur prior to a second of the operations (i.e. in the system, the print processing of a certain job is performed before other print jobs. The printing operation of one print job can occur before other print jobs depending on the traits of the print job. With the system performing certain operations, such as the printing form, ink profile or film thickness, the change of these operations

are performed depending on the order of the print jobs in the system. The different operations that are needed depend on the certain operations needed by the order of print jobs. For example, if a print job needs a change in the ink profile and this print job is first, while a second print job needs a change in film thickness, then the operation of changing the ink profile will occur first and the change in film thickness will occur second. This is an example of a printing process operation being determined to occur before or after a certain process; see col. 3, lines 1-67 and col. 4, lines 1-17).

Re claim 19: The teachings of Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820 are disclosed above. Zingher '468 discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the establishing step includes identifying adjustment and maintenance operations to be carried out during the job change between the first machine job and the subsequent machine job (i.e. regarding the claim feature, the Zingher reference discloses re-sorting the print contents of jobs within the system by comparing the image contents of each job to one another in order to limit the amount of working steps to be applied between jobs. Some of the working steps can include changing the print form, changing the ink profile or film thickness gradient in the inking unit of the printing device. With the printing jobs changing from one job to another, the system determines how to transition to the next job with the slightest amount of adjustment in the printing system. As described in Applicant's specification, the specification discloses establishing an order of adjustments and maintenance operations as changing the printing ink. However, other adjustment and maintenance operations can be performed in order to transition a

printing device to print a subsequent job besides the changing of printing ink. Since the reference of Zingher '468 discloses the feature of changing an ink profile and the reference can perform changing this profile using jobs of single color being transitioned to jobs of multiple colors, it is understood that the process of changing the printing ink in terms of color is performed. In terms of establishing an order of these operations, with each job, a certain change can occur. To transition from job 1 to job 2, a slight change in ink profile may be needed, then changing to job 3 may require a change in the printing form and a change to job 4 may require a film thickness gradient change in the inking unit. Since these different operations can be different depending on the content of the jobs, these operations change, but they have to be established when going from job to job in the system in order to ensure a minimum amount of work for the printing system while changing from job to job. Therefore, since a certain adjustment process can occur for different jobs in different ways and this is established in order for the jobs to be processed, it is believed that the above feature is performed; See col. 3, ll. 57-67, col. 4, ll. 1-17, col. 8, ll. 15-67 and col. 9, ll. 1-17) and then determining when the adjustment and maintenance operations are to be carried out with respect to one another during the job change as a function of the comparing step (i.e. when determining how to change the operations in respect to comparing jobs, the system checks to see if a certain job can be placed between other jobs in order to determine what operations can be carried out in a printing sequence. Also, the system checks which adjustments associated with the job need to be performed during the job change in order to transition between jobs and have the least amount of work performed by the

printing device as possible; see col. 3, line 3 – col. 4, line 17, col. 8, ll. 15-67 and col. 9, ll. 1-17).

Re claim 20: The teachings of Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to specifically teach the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the establishing step includes determining which steps can be performed concurrently and which steps must be performed consecutively.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Löffler '820. Löffler '820 discloses wherein the establishing step includes determining which steps can be performed concurrently and which steps must be performed consecutively (i.e. in the system of Löffler '820, the system involves having multiple components within the printing press system operate in a concurrent manner. It also can decide to have some components work simultaneously while others are actuated after a certain process has been completed. For example, the system may concurrently adjust the ink metering devices concurrently while consecutively actuating the inking mechanism until the subsequent ink zone is substantially achieved; see col. 5, line 14 – col. 4, line 14).

Therefore, in view of Löffler '820, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of wherein the establishing step includes determining which steps can be performed concurrently and which steps must be performed consecutively, incorporated in the device of Löffler '820, in order to have the establishment of an ink profile required for a subsequent print job accomplished by individual process steps (as stated in Löffler '820 col. 4, ln 49-58).

Re claim 21: The teachings of Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the method as recited in claim 3 wherein the order of adjustments and maintenance operations depends on the number of operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine in such a manner that an increased number of operating personnel results in an increased number of steps being performed concurrently.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Löffler '820. Löffler '820 discloses wherein the order of adjustments and maintenance operations depends on the number of operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine in such a manner that an increased number of operating personnel results in an increased number of steps being performed concurrently (i.e. in the system of Löffler '820, operating personal is used to set up a new printing job. If one user is used to start a new printing job, there is only one set of processing steps associated from changing a job from one job to another. However, if there are multiple operators introducing multiple new jobs to the printing press, the printing press then has to perform multiple adjustments and maintenance operations to output each and every job introduced to the system; see col. 2, line 60 – col. 3, line 32).

Therefore, in view of Löffler '820, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of wherein the order of adjustments and maintenance operations depends on the number of operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine in such a manner that an

increased number of operating personnel results in an increased number of steps being performed concurrently, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, in order to have the establishment of an ink profile required for a subsequent print job accomplished by individual process steps (as stated in Löffler '820 col. 4, ln 49-58).

Re claim 22: The teachings of Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the method as recited in claim 1 wherein a first component of the at least two components is an inking unit and a second component of the at least two components is a plate cylinder.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Löffler '820. Löffler '820 discloses wherein a first component of the at least two components is an inking unit and a second component of the at least two components is a plate cylinder (i.e. in the system, the inking unit rotations are used to remove and add printing profiles on the inking unit and the through the decreasing of the direction of the printing plate, an appropriate ink addition gradient can be established for subsequent job printing; see col. 5, lines 14-32 and col. 11, lines 34-51).

Therefore, in view of Löffler '820, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of wherein a first component of the at least two components is an inking unit and a second component of the at least two components is a plate cylinder, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, in order to have the establishment of an ink profile required for a subsequent print job accomplished by individual process steps (as stated in Löffler '820 col. 4, ln 49-58).

Re claim 25: The teachings of Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the method as recited in claim 1 wherein a first component of the at least two components and a second component of the at least two components are driven independently of one another.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Löffler '820. Löffler '820 discloses wherein a first component of the at least two components and a second component of the at least two components are driven independently of one another (i.e. in the system, the inking units (12) and the vibrator roller (24) can the inking duct rollers can be driven independently of one another; see col. 6, line 43 – col. 7, line 49).

Therefore, in view of Löffler '820, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of wherein a first component of the at least two components and a second component of the at least two components are driven independently of one another, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, in order to have the establishment of an ink profile required for a subsequent print job accomplished by individual process steps (as stated in Löffler '820 col. 4, ln 49-58).

9. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher '468, as modified by the features of Löffler '820, as applied to claims 1, 8 and 13 above, and further in view of Rai '747 (US Pub No 2003/0149747).

Re claim 3: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above. Zingher '468 discloses the method wherein a number of printing-material is taken into account in the determination of the optimum procedure (i.e. when the system of Zingher

'468 evaluates the print jobs, the print jobs are compared in pairs and the overall number of print jobs are all compared to each other in order to determine an optimum procedure for print job change; see fig. 4; col. 3, lines 1-66, col. 4, lines 1-17, 44-63 and col. 5, lines 8-49).

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach a number of operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine is taken into account in the determination of the optimum procedure.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Rai '747. Rai '747 discloses a number of operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine is taken into account in the determination of the optimum procedure (i.e. the reference of Rai '747 is used for producing print jobs using production devices, which is similar to the above references (same field of endeavor). However, in determining the resource requirements of each stage of the production process of the print job, the number of available operators is used in finding the requirements. The feature of using the number of operators in the system for the production process in Rai '747 incorporated with the process of finding the optimum procedure to perform during a job change in Zingher '468, performs the above feature; see paragraph [0029]).

Therefore, in view of Rai '747, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a number of operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine is taken into account in the determination of the optimum procedure in order to find the resource requirements in the production process of a print job (as stated in Rai '747 paragraph [0029]).

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher '468, as modified by the features of Löffler '820, as applied to claims 1, 8 and 13 above, and further in view of Yacoub '805 (US Pub No 2003/0011805).

Re claim 4: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

Zingher '468 teaches carrying out the order of processes of the optimum procedure (i.e. after the system of Zingher '468 compares the pairs of print jobs and finds the most suitable way to process the print jobs, the process is carried out to perform the optimum procedure; see fig. 4; col. 3, lines 1-66, col. 4, lines 1-17, 44-63 and col. 5, lines 8-49).

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the method wherein a length of paths to be traveled by operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine while carrying out the order of processes is taken into account in the determination of the optimum procedure.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Yacoub '805. Yacoub '805 discloses a length of paths to be traveled by operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine while carrying out the order of processes is taken into account in the determination of the optimum procedure (i.e. both references of Zingher and Yacoub are concerned with determining parameters to perform a procedure to process a print job (same field of endeavor). However, Yacoub '805 takes into account, while finding the most suitable printer to perform the print job, the closest printer to the user. The distance the user will travel has to be shortest possible to be convenient to

the user. The feature of taking into account the distance the user has to travel of in Yacoub '805 incorporated with the determination of different factors in the optimum procedure while carrying out the order of processes in Zingher '468 performs the above feature; see paragraphs [0024] and [0025]).

Therefore, in view of Yacoub '805, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a length of paths to be traveled by operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine while carrying out the order of processes is taken into account in the determination of the optimum procedure in order to find the most appropriate printer in relation to the physical location of the printer in proximity to the user (as stated in Yacoub '805 paragraph [0025]).

11. Claims 5, 6, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher '468, as modified by the features of Löffler '820, as applied to claims 1, 8 and 13 above, and further in view of Bauer '461 (US Pub No 2001/0039461).

Re claim 5: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the method further comprising visually displaying the established order of processes to operating personnel.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Bauer '461. Bauer '461 discloses comprising visually displaying the established order of processes to operating personnel (i.e. like the references of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820, the Bauer reference is used to output print jobs using production equipment (same field of endeavor)).

However, Bauer '461 has a planning board with display elements for displaying the

individual or number of printing processes that are coordinated and scheduled in the system and this can be shown to operating personnel; see fig.1; paragraphs [0020] and [0029]-[0032]).

Therefore, in view of Bauer '461, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to visually display the established order of processes to operating personnel in order to display individual or a number printing processes to be understood quickly by the operating personnel (as stated in Bauer '461 paragraphs [0020] and [0029]).

Re claim 6: The teachings of Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820 and Bauer '461 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the method wherein the operating personnel are guided through the individual steps of the calculated order of processes via one or more display devices mounted on the printing-material processing machine.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Bauer '461. Bauer '461 discloses the operating personnel are guided through the individual steps of the calculated order of processes via one or more display devices mounted on the printing-material processing machine (i.e. like the references of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820, the Bauer reference is used to output print jobs using production equipment (same field of endeavor). However, Bauer '461 has a planning board with display elements for displaying the individual or number of printing processes that are coordinated and scheduled in the system and this can be shown to operating personnel. The system of

Bauer describes print jobs being calculated in the printing process before they are scheduled and coordinated. These scheduled and coordinated events are then displayed to the user. As the user desires to change the processes on the planning board (4) using the input element (5), the user can see the display of the planning board and use the “drag and drop” technology provided to see the individual steps of the processes and be guided through the process of the planning board (4). Bauer '461 incorporated with the feature of calculating the best order of processes to process a print job in Zingher '468 performs the above feature; see fig.1; paragraphs [0020] and [0029]-[0032]).

Therefore, in view of Bauer '461, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the operating personnel guided through the individual steps of the calculated order of processes via one or more display devices mounted on the printing-material processing machine in order to display individual or a number printing processes to be understood quickly by the operating personnel (as stated in Bauer '461 paragraphs [0020] and [0029]).

Re claim 9: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the device further comprising one or more display devices for displaying the order of operations.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Bauer '461. Bauer '461 discloses the device further comprising one or more display devices for displaying the order of operations (i.e. like the references of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820, the Bauer

reference is used to output print jobs using production equipment (same field of endeavor). However, Bauer '461 has a planning board with display elements for displaying the individual or number of printing processes that are coordinated and scheduled in the system and this can be shown to operating personnel; see fig.1; paragraphs [0020] and [0029]-[0032]).

Therefore, in view of Bauer '461, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have one or more display devices for displaying the order of operations in order to display individual or a number printing processes to be understood quickly by the operating personnel (as stated in Bauer '461 paragraphs [0020] and [0029]).

Re claim 12: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the device further comprising a display device or a system for acoustic communication for communicating information or errors.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Bauer '461. Bauer '461 discloses the device further comprising a display device or a system for acoustic communication for communicating information or errors (i.e. like the references of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820, the Bauer reference is used to output print jobs using production equipment (same field of endeavor). However, Bauer '461 has a planning board with display elements for displaying the individual or number of printing processes that are coordinated and scheduled in the system and this can be shown to operating personnel. This information is used to communicate information to the user or operating

personnel and this system is also capable of displaying operating errors to the user; see fig.1; paragraphs [0020] and [0029]-[0032]).

Therefore, in view of Bauer '461, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a display device or a system for acoustic communication for communicating information or errors in order to display individual or a number printing processes to be understood quickly by the operating personnel (as stated in Bauer '461 paragraphs [0020] and [0029]).

12. Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher '468, as modified by Löffler '820 and Bauer '461, and further in view of Tada '652 (USP 4572652).

Re claim 7: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the method wherein the established order of processes is communicated to operating personnel.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Bauer '461. Bauer '461 discloses the established order of processes is communicated to operating personnel (i.e. like the references of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820, the Bauer reference is used to output print jobs using production equipment (same field of endeavor). However, Bauer '461 has a planning board with display elements for displaying the individual or number of printing processes that are coordinated and scheduled in the system and this can be shown to operating personnel. This information is used to communicate information to

the user or operating personnel and this system is also capable of displaying operating errors to the user; see fig.1; paragraphs [0020] and [0029]-[0032]).

However, Zingher '468 in view of Bauer '461 fails to teach in acoustic form.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Tada '652. Tada '652 discloses in acoustic form (i.e. the system of Tada '652 is similar to the systems of Bauer and Zingher in the manner in which all systems are concerned with outputting print data (same field of endeavor). However, Tada '652 discloses system that allows for the printing system to communicate necessary operation steps to the operator using the printing device. The printing device indicates to the operator what steps to perform in the output process. This performs the feature of communicating auditory instructions to a user in the operation of a printing device; see col. 1, ll. 57-64).

Therefore, in view of Tada '652, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the established order of processes is communicated to operating personnel in acoustic form, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, as modified by the features of Bauer '461, in order to indicate to an operator what operation steps to perform next in the printing process (as stated in Tada '652 col. 1, ll. 10-14).

Re claim 10: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the device further comprising a system for communication of the established order of operations to operating personnel.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Bauer '461. Bauer '461 discloses a system for communication of the established order of operations to operating personnel (i.e. Bauer '461 has a planning board with display elements for displaying the individual or number of printing processes that are coordinated and scheduled in the system and this can be shown to operating personnel. This information is used to communicate information to the user or operating personnel and this system is also capable of displaying operating errors to the user; see fig.1; paragraphs [0020] and [0029]-[0032]).

However, Zingher '468 in view of Bauer '461 fails to teach acoustic communication.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Tada '652. Tada '652 discloses acoustic communication (i.e. the system of Tada '652 is similar to the systems of Bauer and Zingher in the manner in which all systems are concerned with outputting print data (same field of endeavor). However, Tada '652 discloses system that allows for the printing system to communicate necessary operation steps to the operator using the printing device. The printing device indicates to the operator what steps to perform in the output process. This performs the feature of communicating auditory instructions to a user in the operation of a printing device; see col. 1, ll. 57-64).

Therefore, in view of Tada '652, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a system for acoustic communication of the established order of operations to operating personnel, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, as modified by the features of Bauer '461, in order to indicate to an

operator what operation steps to perform next in the printing process (as stated in Tada '652 col. 1, ll. 10-14).

13. Claim 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher '468, modified by Löffler '820, Bauer '461 and Tada '652, and further in view of Silvester (US Pub No 2003/0161292).

Re claim 11: The teachings of Zingher '468, modified by Löffler '820, Bauer '461 and Tada '652 are disclosed above.

Zingher '468 teaches the device wherein the system connected to the control computer (i.e. the data processing device includes a processor that controls the determination of the order of processing the print jobs; see col. 3, lines 1-66, col. 4, lines 1-17, 44-63 and col. 5, lines 8-49).

However, Zingher '468 in view of Bauer '461 fails to teach a system for acoustic communication.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Tada '652. Tada '652 discloses a system for acoustic communication (i.e. the system of Tada '652 is similar to the systems of Bauer and Zingher in the manner in which all systems are concerned with outputting print data (same field of endeavor). However, Tada '652 discloses a system that allows for the printing system to communicate necessary operation steps to the operator using the printing device. The printing device indicates to the operator what steps to perform in the output process. This performs the feature of

communicating auditory instructions to a user in the operation of a printing device; see col. 1, ll. 57-64).

Therefore, in view of Tada '652, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a system for acoustic communication, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, as modified by the features of Bauer '461, in order to indicate to an operator what operation steps to perform next in the printing process (as stated in Tada '652 col. 1, ll. 10-14).

However, Zingher '468, modified by Bauer '461, and further in view of Tada '652 fails to teach includes at least one headset wirelessly.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Silvester '292. Silvester '292 discloses a system for acoustic communication includes at least one headset wirelessly connected to the control computer (i.e. the system of Silvester is similar to the reference of Zingher in the manner in which Zingher's printing device communicates with a remote device that processes data(same field of endeavor). However, Silvester '292 discloses a wireless headset and other wireless devices connected to a computer. With the host computer being able to send information to the other wireless devices for control coupled with the audible signals of Tada '652, the above claim limitation is performed; see ¶ [0045]-[0047]).

Therefore, in view of Silvester '292, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a system for acoustic communication includes at least one headset wirelessly connected to the control

computer in order to have a wireless headset able to receive information from a computer from various audio sources (as stated in Silvester '292 at ¶ [0031]).

14. Claims 14, 15, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher '468, as modified by the features of Löffler '820, as applied to claims 1, 8 and 13 above, and further in view of Pfeiffer '102 (USP 5447102).

Re claim 14: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the printing press further comprising at least one main drive for driving printing cylinders and plate cylinders or a blanket cylinder as well as separately driven inking units and inking rollers that can be turned off.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Pfeiffer '102. Pfeiffer '102 discloses the printing press further comprising at least one main drive for driving printing cylinders and plate cylinders or a blanket cylinder (i.e. the invention of Pfeiffer is similar to the Zingher reference in the manner in which the invention uses printing production devices to output printed data (same field of endeavor). However, looking at figure 1A, the press drive (25) drives both the plate cylinder (11) and the blanket cylinder (16). These components have their own separate drivers; see fig. 1A; col. 5, lines 50-66 and col. 6, lines 1-67) as well as separately driven inking units and inking rollers that can be turned off (i.e. the inking units (12) have associated ink rollers (32) and the vibrator roller drive (29) with the application throw-off drives the ink applicator rollers. These same ink applicator rollers can be turned off as well; see col. 6, lines 1-46 and col. 8, lines 34-57).

Therefore, in view of Pfeiffer '102, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have a printing press comprising at least one main drive for driving printing cylinders and plate cylinders or a blanket cylinder as well as separately driven inking units and inking rollers that can be turned off in order to have a printing unit apart of a rotary printing press (as stated in Pfeiffer '102 col. 5, lines 50-54).

Re claim 15: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the printing press further comprising individual drives for driving cylinders or additional components.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Pfeiffer '102. Pfeiffer '102 discloses the printing press further comprising individual drives for driving cylinders or additional components (i.e. the invention of Pfeiffer is similar to the Zingher reference in the manner in which the invention uses printing production devices to output printed data (same field of endeavor). However, the press drive is an example of an individual drive for the printing cylinder that will drive the printing cylinder to rotate. The other individual drives for the additional components can include the drives for the inking unit and the respective ink rollers; see fig. 1A; col. 5, lines 50-66 and col. 6, lines 1-67).

Therefore, in view of Pfeiffer '102, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have individual drives for driving cylinders or additional components in order to auxiliary mechanisms to drive different components in the printing unit (as stated in Pfeiffer '102 see col. 5, lines 50-54 and col. 6, lines 40-46).

Re claim 23: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, the combination of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 fails to specifically teach the method as recited in claim 1 wherein one of the at least two components is an offset printing cylinder.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Pfeiffer '102. Pfeiffer '102 discloses wherein one of the at least two components is an offset printing cylinder (i.e. the system of Pfeiffer discloses the feature of having the blanket roller cleaned by one command to perform adjustments and maintenance steps on the overall device. Since the blanket cylinder contains the blanket for printing and the offset printing cylinder is analogous to the blanket cylinder, the Pfeiffer invention performs the feature of having one of the components as an offset printing cylinder; see col. 3, lines 6-33).

Therefore, in view of Pfeiffer '102, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of wherein one of the at least two components is an offset printing cylinder, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, as modified by the device of Löffler '820, in order to have a certain printing press elements cleaned after entering a command in the system (as stated in Pfeiffer '102 col. 3, lines 16-27).

Re claim 24: The teachings of Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the method as recited in claim 1 wherein one of the at least two components is a coating unit.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Pfeiffer '102. Pfeiffer '102 discloses wherein one of the at least two components is a coating unit (i.e. the system of Pfeiffer discloses the feature of having the blanket roller cleaned by one command to perform adjustments and maintenance steps on the overall device. Since the blanket cylinder contains the blanket for printing, makes up the coating unit and the offset printing cylinder is analogous to the blanket cylinder, the Pfeiffer invention performs the feature of having one of the components as a coating unit; see col. 3, lines 6-33).

Therefore, in view of Pfeiffer '102, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the feature of wherein one of the at least two components is a coating unit, incorporated in the device of Zingher '468, as modified by the device of Löffler '820, in order to have a certain printing press elements cleaned after entering a command in the system (as stated in Pfeiffer '102 col. 3, lines 16-27).

15. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher '468 in view of Löffler '820, Bauer '461 and Jackson '848.

Re claim 16: The teachings of Zingher '468 and Löffler '820 are disclosed above.

However, Zingher '468 fails to teach the method as recited in claim 1 wherein the establishing step includes accessing a table containing durations of the operations.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Bauer '461. Bauer '461 discloses wherein the establishing step includes accessing a table containing the operations (i.e. in Bauer '461, the memory unit (13) contains planning data that can be

accessed by the production unit in the system. The memory unit is considered as a table since it is accessed and it contains information that is used in the production sequence related to the printing processes; see paragraphs [0012]-[0015] and [0027]-[0031]).

Therefore, in view of Bauer '461, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of wherein the establishing step includes accessing the table containing the operations in order to make planning data available to be called up by production when scheduling and coordinating a print job (as stated in Bauer '461 paragraphs [0027]-[0030]).

However, Zingher '468 in view of Bauer '461 fails to teach containing durations of the operations.

However, this is well known in the art as evidenced by Jackson '848. Jackson '848 discloses containing durations of the operations (i.e. like the reference of Bauer, the Jackson reference is concerned with the workflow and coordination of jobs in the system. Like the Zingher reference, the Jackson reference is concerned with producing printed material from print jobs (same field of endeavor). However, information regarding the speed and time required for the machines to perform various operations is contained in the job cost module (14). With the combination of a memory unit of Bauer containing a unit that is accessible and has information regarding operations combined with the feature of containing information on the time required to perform an operation in the Jackson reference, the above feature is performed; see col. 5, lines 13-39).

Therefore, in view of Jackson '848, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have the method step of containing durations of the operations in order to have information regarding the time required for machines to perform various operations (as stated in Jackson '848 col. 5, lines 13-39).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAD DICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2625

/C. D./
/Chad Dickerson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625